

ject, but after the lapse of three or four years considerable fault was found with me for having pursued that course, particularly by an hon. colleague of ours who is now no more, and who filled the chair before the hon. gentleman who now occupies it, Mr. Christie. He urged with considerable shew of authority and reason, that it was not proper for the leader of the House to lend his aid or pronounce strongly one way or the other upon a Private Bill, and that there was no distinction between Divorce Bills, and Private Bills, and that I certainly ought not to have charge of a Private Bill. The task to me was an onerous and excēdingly disagreeable one, and as that appeared to be the feeling of the House, I was very glad to let it go by and allow any one who wished to deal with these Bills, and the practice has gone ever since in the direction which the hon. member from Richmond has alluded to; but it is very necessary that some one here should watch the proceedings in the same way as a Judge presiding in a Court would watch them if such a case were submitted to him. It is necessary that all the forms and notices which the law requires should be observed. I do not at all mean to say that it has not been done in this case: I presume it has been done, but I am speaking generally, it is very desirable and necessary. With regard to the mode of naming the Committee, that is more difficult. I suppose the only way would be to leave the matter in the hands of the House, and have the Committee composed of the seven members who received the highest number of votes. It is very desirable, at least those who have charge of such Bills think so, to have gentlemen of the legal profession on the Committee, and they consider it also desirable to exclude those who think divorce ought not to be granted at all, and in that way it makes it very difficult. I think the gentleman who has charge of the Bill should endeavor to secure, as far as possible, a fair judicial Committee, and so far as I am concerned, I shall be willing to render any service I can if the House agrees with the view taken by the hon. member from Richmond; I should make it my duty to watch the Bills, not as I did before, taking them up and disposing of them on my own judgment and the action of the House, but to watch them as *amicus curiae*. I do think that

it would be a desirable thing, only if I discharge that duty, I hope members who have charge of such measures will feel that it is only because it is my duty—because it is a duty which should be discharged by some one, and it very naturally devolves on the leader of the House, to see that all this legislation is regularly and carefully conducted.

HON. MR. KAULBACH—I may say that I have very reluctantly taken charge of this Bill. I believe the promoter endeavoured to get some person else, and failed, and I felt it my duty to act for him. I am not acquainted with the gentleman who is moving in this matter, nor am I familiar with his case, but I fully concur in all that has been said by the leader of the House, and by the hon. member from Richmond. It may be remembered that I expressed similar views when the Campbell Divorce Case was before the Senate. I do not believe that these Committees are usually drawn in such a way that they are likely to discharge fairly and judicially the duties imposed upon them. So far as I am myself concerned, knowing no more about the Bill than that it has been placed in my hands, I shall endeavour to see that a Committee is so selected that there shall be no suspicion of partiality on the part of its members. I fully agree as to the unsatisfactory manner in which these matters are often brought before the Senate and disposed of; but in this case the whole proceedings preparatory to the introduction of the Bill, so far as I know, have been regular. I have looked to that myself, to some extent, and I was this morning before the Committee which has reported upon the case.

HON. MR. BOTSFORD—The objection which has been taken by the hon. member from Richmond is a very serious one, as regards the mode of selecting the tribunal, and the difficulty is increased by the fact that certain members of the Senate are opposed to all such legislation, and it would not be fair, under those circumstances, to select any gentleman who is decidedly opposed to carrying out the object of the Bill. Now, the only remedy, to my mind, which can under these circumstances be adopted, is to leave the selection to the Speaker of the Senate. He will avoid, of course, select-